



South Mountain Corridor Study

Citizens Advisory Team

Meeting Summary

Date: December 1, 2005
Time: 5:30 p.m.
Location: District 6 Komatke Center, Learning Center Meeting Hall

CAT Members Attending:

Rock Argabright, Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce
 Laurel Arndt, Ahwatukee Foothills Village Planning Committee
 Kris Black, Ahwatukee Foothills HOA
 Jim Buster, Avondale
 Clayton Danzeisen, Maricopa County Farm Bureau
 Peggy Eastburn, Estrella Village Planning Committee
 Michael Goodman, Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council
 Don Jones, Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce

David Lafferty, Tolleson
 Bob Moss, United Dairymen of Arizona
 Wayne Nelson, GRIC District 7
 Nathaniel Percharo, I-10 Pecos Landowners
 Laurie Prendergast, Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development
 Michelle Pulich-Stewart, Sierra Club
 Jim Strogon, Kyrene Lagos Elementary School
 Anthony Villareal, GRIC District 6
 Dave Williams, Knight Transportation/AMTA

Staff and Consultants:

Mike Bruder, ADOT
 Matt Burdick, ADOT
 Kelly Cairo, GCI
 Ken Davis, FHWA
 Ray Dovalina, COP
 Amy Edwards, HDR

Ralph Ellis, ADOT
 Theresa Gunn, GCI
 Bill Hayden, ADOT
 Bob Hazlett, MAG
 Michael LaBianca, HDR

Dan Lance, ADOT
 John Roberts, GRIC
 Roger Roy, MAG
 Ben Spargo, HDR
 Bill Vachon, FHWA

Citizens:

Baloka Belezamo
 Derek Cokkett
 Norm Dahle
 William Eastburn
 David Folts
 Jim Jochim
 Larry Lee
 Matthew Alan Lord

Fred Montague
 Doug Murphy
 Kimchi Nguyen
 Lisa Percharo
 Kwalin Pipkin
 Corinne Purtill
 William Ramsay
 Greta Rogers

Brian Smith
 P. Soroquisara
 Howard Stucker
 Dave Swisher
 David Underwood

ACTION PLAN

Task/Activity	Who	When
Provide map of groundwater levels in the Laveen area.	Amy Edwards	January, 2006
Provide more information about cuts required in South Mountain Park.	Amy Edwards	To be included with 4(f) Report
Verify intent of purple dots on business map in E1 area and report to SMCAT.	Amy Edwards	1-5-06 CAT meeting

Provide updated map showing growth and employment outside study area and post to website.	Amy Edwards; Kelly Cairo	Prior to 1-5-06 CAT meeting
Obtain and provide to SMCAT all evaluation criteria as one document.	Theresa Gunn	Prior to 1-5-06 CAT meeting
Provide number of homes in the right-of-way with and without a 32 nd Street interchange.	Amy Edwards	1-5-06 CAT meeting

Welcome

Theresa Gunn welcomed attendees and explained that comments from public attendees are accepted in writing, and if possible, responses provided. She noted that the agenda now shows the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team issues near the conclusion of the meeting and asked members if they had any concerns about this change. There were no concerns stated.

Project Update

Amy Edwards provided follow-up information to CAT questions regarding the project. She explained that the traffic update is not yet available. This is due to a change in running the traffic model with four general purpose lanes and one HOV lane in each direction. Previous traffic model runs were for three general purpose lanes in each direction. Some future reports will be affected and any changes to previously provided reports will be noted. She also introduced Ray Dovalina, City of Phoenix, and Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments, who were both in available to answer any specific questions.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: The five lanes in each direction does not affect the amount of right-of-way?

Response: This is correct.

Question: When did this change occur? **Response:** Five lanes in each direction has always been the ultimate buildout and was previously discussed in October, 2005.

Edwards reviewed profile information. She showed a Laveen elevation with partial depression at Dobbins, which could be drained to the Salt River without needing a pump station. A fully underground section below Dobbins and Elliot would require pump stations. Gunn asked CAT members what their preference might be.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: What are the implications of a pump station? **Response:** Cost, long-term operations, and maintenance are considerations involved in using a pump station.

Question: What would be an example of a semi- and fully depressed freeway?

Response: Semi-depressed is lowered nine feet and arterial streets would be raised

above the freeway. A fully depressed section is lowered 25 feet and the arterials remain at the same level.

Question: Is ADOT/FHWA willing to spend the extra money to do this? **Response:** This is an option we are putting forward

Question: Are there ground water issues? **Response:** The highest estimated level is at nine feet in this area.

Comment: I would like to see a map of groundwater levels in this area. Can we find out if this is a viable option before reaching the 30 percent design phase? Does our interest trigger some action on your part? **Response:** We need to do our best to verify that any proposed option is buildable. There should be information from other agencies to collect. However at this stage, we try to avoid physically disturbing the land.

Comment: I can provide the name of a group that might have useful well data.

Edwards reviewed profile information in the Ahwatukee area. In order to depress the area, drainage basins would be required in addition to a channel on the north side of Pecos Road. The basins would take an additional 210 acres and displace an additional 430 homes. Edwards asked for comments on this information, in light of the impact to residents.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: I believe most of these drainage issues under Pecos Road are west of 24th Street. Is this issue of handling water relevant to the entire Pecos Road area? **Response:** This is an issue in the 32nd – 40th street area. There is a linear park and an area near the school in the 32nd - 24th street area. We will look at this more closely when we review the video later in the meeting.

Question: What about the area near the school? **Response:** A linear drainage channel would be needed in that area.

Comment: I have always thought an attempt to lower a freeway is to maintain the psychological cohesiveness of the community.

Question: Is there enough retention even for an elevated freeway? Do you need a detention area for pumping, or to allow for absorbing water in the basins? **Response:** With a freeway at grade, or elevated, the existing drainage features would be remain in place. With a semi-depressed or fully depressed freeway in this area, water would need to be pumped over or under a freeway. Whether the water is pumped over or under the freeway, a facility to hold that water until it can be pumped is needed. This is why drainage basins are needed on the north side of Pecos Road.

Question: Can there be something like an aqua duct to maintain flow over the freeway, and just pump water from the depressed area? **Response:** Variations of this have been done, in part of the Central Arizona Project. However, this option requires an additional 8-10 feet of depression of a freeway.

Comment: I believe that water in this area is being managed through two points.

Response: The city designs streets with smaller drainage systems, and will accommodate a 10-year flood event. This project would be designed for a 50-year event.

Comment: There are current flood issues in the school area.

Comment: The I-10 Pecos Landowners has 5,000 members. We have discussed this issue, yet we have never been approached about what we think about drainage and a freeway. What have we not been asked is, “How do you feel?”? (A CAT member asked the landowner: How do you feel?) We feel that Ahwatukee is going to push it on us regardless. Also, we have never been approached – if District 6 doesn’t want a freeway, the I-10 Pecos Landowners can still be approached, and we haven’t been. The tribe won’t tell you they don’t have authority over us.

Gunn clarified that every time the project team has been invited, they have attended I-10 Pecos Landowner meetings, and participated in question and answer sessions. The landowner agreed that this was correct. He also agreed that allottees cannot make a decision on this issue without the Community, and that there was not an alignment that could be drawn that would be solely on allottee lands. Edwards noted that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has been contacted regarding sending information to landowners. To date, they have not responded.

Comment: I can’t imagine Ahwatukee would want an additional 430 homes removed.

Comment: I think this group does listen to each other. Why do you think this group hasn’t been listening?

Comment: It is the atmosphere we are subject to. If allottees are going to have all of this water runoff, we should have a voice in what happens.

Question: Regarding mitigation, how would you address not having a Pecos Road to drive on during construction? **Response:** This is part of what is looked at in phasing options. There is also a mitigation committee being put together. ADOT, FHWA, HDR and technical representatives will be on the committee and the individuals will be determined soon. Right now there are just professionals, and not any community members.

Question: How is right-of-way cost affected? **Response:** We are working on this information, which will be part of an upcoming report.

Question: If the freeway was depressed, how would migration patterns be preserved?

Response: This information will be discussed with the biology report.

Edwards reviewed information regarding removal of the 32nd Street interchange, explaining that the option was shown at the public meetings held in November.

Question: When will a full separate study be done on the other arterials and circulation of street traffic?

Question: If interchanges at 32nd Street and 25th Avenue can be taken out at the request of the City of Phoenix, what happens if the Gila River Indian Community requests these be put back in? **Response:** We have requested preferences from GRIC. Once an interchange is removed, it probably can’t be put back in due to assumptions in planning. Neither jurisdiction can trump the other.

Question: How many people go on and off 32nd Street right now? **Response:** We are asking MAG to run the model again without this interchange. **Reply:** You need to see the volume of traffic at 32nd Street and Pecos right now.

Comment: The reality is that everyone to the west of this area uses Pecos to drive their kids to school. **Response:** We are going to the city for additional data. **Reply:** If the data is more than three years old, it is too old.

Edwards reviewed 25th Avenue interchange information. She then asked the CAT if they found the more detailed technical reports helpful. A few said that they appreciated the additional figures.

Video and Technical Report Review

Edwards introduced Mike LaBianca, HDR, as a resource for answering technical questions. Reports reviewed included Social Conditions, Visual Resources, and Title VI and Environmental Resources. Edwards reviewed the alternatives, beginning with W101 and moving east.

W101 Alternative/CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: When was the video taken? **Response:** We recorded during the first week of October, 2005.

Comment: Tolleson is a unique community for two reasons. It has a very small square footage, and it is comprised of a more than 80 percent minority population, which includes a 78 percent Hispanic population. Although this route represents no residential displacement, there would be business loss. There is currently commercial development in the area of the W101 alternative.

Question: Will the expansion area of Tolleson High School be considered by the mitigation committee? **Response:** It will be addressed; however, this is not a 4(f) area.

Question: Why isn't air quality part of Environmental Justice? **Response:** There is not a disproportionate impact to these populations.

Question: Would there be an off-ramp at Van Buren Street? **Response:** This is under discussion with the City of Tolleson. At this time, the city has not asked the study team to remove the Van Buren interchange. Also, there is an ADOT/Tolleson resident meeting in the planning stages.

Question: Does truck traffic need a Van Buren interchange? **Response:** No, but trucks would need a 99th Avenue interchange.

Question: What are the implications of splitting a very small development? **Response:** We do look at relocations and community cohesion. However, I am not sure how small an area is reviewed for these factors.

W75 Alternative/CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: Santa Maria residents have a long history in this area – with an average residency of twice as long as the typical Maricopa County resident.

Question: Has there been any discussion about not having an interchange in the area?

Response: This will continue to be discussed with the City of Phoenix.

Comment: Even though the alignment now missed the historic community, it seems like it would still impact the community due to the proximity. **Response:** We do look at indirect affects of being near a freeway.

Question: Is there a different level of concern for a school in a 4(f) versus non-4(f) area?

Response: Impacts are considered. In a 4(f) community, we do address proximity issues such as detracting from the historic issues associated with the property.

Question: Do we have a modified map with the new Santa Maria alignment? **Response:** That was distributed at a previous meeting..

Question: Has ADOT verified that the State Real Estate Board is notifying buyers?

Response: (There was general discussion on this issue, with examples provided where this is not occurring, and where it is occurring with recorded dates and times of signatures on forms. A comment was also made that people are receiving the information, but choosing not to listen to the implications.)

Comment: W71 is the weakest route of the three and should be eliminated. Since it would take out the most homes of the three west side alternatives, it should be eliminated.

Response: (A CAT member noted that this observation is based on just one criteria.)

Question: Why is there so little development along areas of W55? **Response:** This is an industrial area and is pending additional sewer installation before more building can occur.

Question: What is the real number of houses on the west side? **Response:** We will have to continue to answer this question throughout the process.

Question: Is this the “windiest” route of the three? **Response:** It is acceptable under safety and design standards.

Question: Is “no-build” still an option? **Response:** Yes.

W55 Alternative/CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: In the area north of Broadway, the right-of-way is not wide enough. Which homes would be displaced? **Response:** There would be some homes on each side in the right-of-way.

Question: What about changing the interchange at I-10 to avoid businesses? I can’t imagine it would be easy to find a site that will allow jet fuel tanks. **Response:** This is also under discussion with the City of Phoenix.

Question: Can the freeway be raised enough to avoid problems with these businesses and the tank farm? **Response:** The movement of these types of businesses could be considered a complication, similar to the railroad spurs. This has been done in the past. Rights to the space over the building and fire suppression retrofits are considerations included as part of the cost to building the freeway.

Question: When will there be discussion about the affect on I-10 with any of these connections? What about additional traffic between 55th Avenue and SR 101?

Response: This will be included with the traffic report.

Question: Will we look at the affect to businesses at the I-10? **Response:** Yes, this will be in the economic report.

E1 Alternative/CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Question: What is the smooth area before South Mountain Park? **Response:** Believe this is buried water and power lines in the area.

Question: Would a vote of the public be needed if you move the alignment slightly when it is within a 4(f) area? **Response:** This is an evolving issue. We are looking to address this question in the Section 4(f) report, pending completion of the legal review.

Comment: Regarding habitats, some of the most sensitive land, and as yet unbuilt, is in the valley from the south ridge to the north ridge of South Mountain Park.

Question: I believe the cuts to the park would be more like 320 feet, not the 220 feet as stated at the public meetings in November. I would like more information. **Response:** The 220 feet for cut height is measured from the northern edge of right-of-way to the northern ditch bottom. Existing ground is higher near the proposed centerline of the freeway.

Question: How do you protect significant areas of South Mountain? **Response:** We go through the Section 106 process, which includes working with the Community, and we hope that GRIC cultural resources will provide ADOT with information, as well as other tribes.

Question: Why is this not an EJ issue? **Response:** This is addressed as a 4(f) traditional/cultural issue. It is also why all of the reports should be considered as a whole.

Comment: The San Francisco Peaks are also considered a sacred site, which seems analogous to this issue.

Comment: The entire mountain itself is sacred. Even if cultural resources provides information, it should have limited dispersion of information. For example, that information should not go to this group.

Comment: I would like to know more about this site, even if it is not specific details that cannot be shared. **Response:** We have initiated consultation.

Comment: The whole mountain is sacred. It has taken me my whole life to understand this, and it cannot be conveyed in 30 seconds. Also, it would not be appropriate to do so.

Comment: South Mountain would be one place that it would be appropriate to elevate a freeway. This would assist wildlife habitats and drainage issues.

Question: Why doesn't EJ apply to tribal land? **Response:** EJ is considered in all communities. However, this is not a property issue.

Question: Why not use a box culvert throughout the Pecos Road alignment, like the example shown. **Response:** This is possible, but there would be additional costs and other impacts. We are using the box culvert in the 4(f) area indicated to avoid impacts to the protected resource.

Question: It looks like there are a lot of businesses along Pecos Road. What do the purple dots really mean? If the data here is not correct, data should not be taken at face value anywhere in this process. **Response:** We will verify the intent with the report author and report back to you next time.

Question: Is there any compensation for those left behind, but do not have direct impacts? **Response:** No.

Question: If the 25th/27th Avenue interchange is removed, there would be no access to homes. **Response:** An area cannot be left without access. This would be mitigated.

Comment: We should see other areas of growth and employment on the map, not just those in the study area. This map is misleading. **Response:** We will post a revised map to the website.

Public Meetings

Gunn thanked CAT members who attended the public meetings and expressed her appreciation for Rock Argabright's assistance for approximately eight hours at the Ahwatukee meeting. Meeting information included:

- November 15, Avondale: 163 attendees. More people attended from noon-4 p.m. than from 4-8 p.m.
- November 16, Laveen: 464 attendees.
- November 17, Ahwatukee: 2,103 attendees. There was steady attendance during (and before) the entire open house period.
- Since the meetings, we have received and entered 1,653 comment forms. Comment forms reflect:
 - Ahwatukee: 70 percent say, "no-build."
 - Avondale: 25 percent say, "no-build."
 - Laveen: 25 percent say, "no-build."
- For the first time, many comment forms from Laveen express opposition to the W71 alignment.

Gunn noted that discussions in 2000 agreed that there was indeed a purpose and need to build a South Mountain facility, though the comment most often received was, "build it, just not HERE." She asked CAT members for any insight as to why there are so many no-build comments at this time.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: Those new to Ahwatukee may not have an appreciation of the previous traffic difficulties in the area.

Comment: Some have said, "Ahwatukee residents should live and work in Ahwatukee."

Comment: There may be a better means than a freeway to move people.

Comment: Perhaps in 2003, there was more hope that a freeway would be placed on GRIC; whereas now this seems less likely.

Comment: Now that people are seeing details, they might not like the location.

Comment: This could be reactionary.

Comment: The last three months of news coverage show other areas that need a freeway more than Ahwatukee. A South Mountain Freeway would not solve the problem, just load up the system differently.

Comment: I feel that there is still a purpose and need, but the impact from the southern area has not been addressed.

Comment: In Laveen, the feeling is that this is too little, too late. Perhaps this should be a super-expressway for something further out.

Comment: This is not a scientific process. People that have a grudge will fill out a form. Also, Avondale is predicted to be the center of the Valley by 2025. This freeway isn't the end, it's just the beginning.

Comment: We are only hearing from people who are very biased. Growth can't stop without stopping home building.

Comment: Gila River has a lot of traffic snaking through the reservation already. We would like to see a freeway to move people regionally.

SMCAT Issues

Evaluation Criteria

Gunn distributed additional evaluation criteria as provided by CAT members and will provide the information as one document. Discussion regarding what alternatives will be evaluated by the CAT included:

Comment: We know that a no-build anywhere kills the whole project.

Question: What is the timeline for moving forward on the east side, regardless of whether a GRIC alternative has been offered? **Response:** There is no deadline at this time.

Comment: I fear that if we break ground on the west side, without information on the east side, the Pecos Road alignment will just happen. **Response:** No, this is not how the process works. **Reply:** I want this in writing.

Question: When will we reconvene for an east side process?

Question: When does a west side draft EIS get stale?

Comment: I thought the process would include a Pecos vs. no-build option.

The group reached consensus that they would evaluate:

- West side: Three build options and no-build option
- East side: Pecos option and no-build options
- Impacts to the overall alignment.

Gunn commented that the group may need to consider the reports as a whole. Dan Lance noted that ADOT is being pressured to select a preferred west side alignment so that the city planning representatives can move forward. They want to hear what the CAT has to say on these choices. However, normally, a build/no-build is usually part of the draft EIS process.

CAT Member Questions and Comments:

Comment: We could wait for all of the reports to come out, then go over them geographically. **Response:** Yes, however, the current approach was selected in order to provide the CAT with the information as soon as it was available.

Question: Will we meet beyond 2006? **Response:** This will be discussed after the January evaluation.

CAT Membership Questions

Gunn reviewed membership issues. She reminded the CAT that for some time the position for the Lakewood Homeowners Association has been vacant and that the association is working on finding a representative. The Woodside HOA has requested a seat on the CAT. Member comment included:

Comment: We are from Ahwatukee and understand the implications to the Woodside area.

Gunn announced Jim Buster's newly elected position to the Avondale City Council. She explained that the CAT was initially formed to get input from community members in a non-political role. Member discussion on Buster's continued participation included several individuals who expressed the desire for the group to stay stable, and an appreciation for Buster's input to this point. There was no opposition to Buster's continued membership in the CAT.

Respond to Written Comments/Questions:

Gunn noted that all comments and questions will be included in the draft EIS with the response. She explained that she asked the authors whether it would be acceptable to not read the duplicate comments so long as she guaranteed that the input would be recorded in the draft EIS, and that the authors agreed. Comments and questions read during the meeting are recorded here verbatim from forms received.

Larry Lee

Comment: If Gila River is requesting frontage roads and access to the loop 202, then they definitely are showing that they want and need the road. GRIC wants commercial development, Ahwatukee does not want any significant commercial development. If GRIC wants commercial then GRIC should take the road, otherwise give GRIC no access and no frontage road. We do not want another casino along Pecos/202. No casino!

William Ramsay

Question: Have any comprehensive studies been conducted on the impact to surface streets adjoining the proposed freeway when the freeway becomes closed due to an accident? For example, what would be the impact on 40th St., 24th St., and Chandler Blvd. If the proposed east 202 loop is closed at 40th St.? Where would traffic be routed? Have extra studies – air, noise gas pollution, been evaluated under these conditions? The study AWA in question includes Ahwatukee, Avondale, Laveen and Tolleson.

Response: Typically, this is not done.

Larry Lee

Questions and comments: I believe about 7 schools are directly affected by this proposed highway. What are all of the dangers to our kids? Pollution, noise, air. Road closures, what about accidents where large vehicles like trucks, 18 wheelers carrying whatever, fuel, hazardous material seems that the kids would be in very serious danger. Isn't route I-8 and 85 for trucks? If 202 is a truck route, why are the trucks not using the route we already gave them? NO BUILD. **Response:** SR85 is a truck route and signed as such.

Comment and question: 24th ramps turning 24th into a main artery and what are the issues to affect Estrella Elementary School. Will all of 24th need to be widened and will 24th and Chandler need to be enlarged? How do we handle traffic if a road closure occurs near 24th street? Will traffic route to Liberty Lane, this will affect 3 schools. **Response:** This was previously discussed.

William Ramsay

Question: What role does Maricopa Association of Governments play in the decision to proceed with the South Mtn Loop 202? If FHWA is the ultimate decision maker, what is MAG's role? **Response:** MAG has input into the process; however, a freeway is an ADOT-FHWA decision. ADOT and MAG share regional transportation planning responsibilities. Proposition 400 is based on the Regional Transportation Plan, which considers 55th Avenue the approved location for the west side alignment. If W71 or W101 are selected, these locations must go to MAG for approval by the regional council.

Comment: If advocates of the of the proposed South Mountain Loop 202 are so certain we must have this project, why are they willing to wait the better part of TWO DECADES for a solution? This project is too future oriented as to be irrelevant to current Maricopa County residents.

David Foltz

Question: How many of the new homeowners identified in the right of way for S. Mt. Loop 202 (highway edge to the red line) along Pecos Road have been notified by ADOT on policy procedure or protocol for having their homes acquired? **Response:** This question has been directed to ADOT right-of-way.

Question: What is the additional cost to fully depress vs. partially depressed highway per mile for the entire highway called south mt. Loop 202? **Response:** These figures are in the process of being completed.

Question: Is it possible that many of homes identified in ADOT maps in mid Novembers public meetings located in the Right of Way (Edge of S. Mt. Loop 202 and the Red line) in Ahwatukee will no be purchased after all. If not, why? Would this same rule exist for the selected west side route? **Response:** The final number is yet to be determined. The facility is being designed to a level to define the right-of way needed to construct it. It should not be assumed that significant change to right-of-way will occur after receipt of the environmental approval. (A CAT member requested receiving these numbers with and without a 32nd Street interchange.)

Question: If Pecos Rd. is left open during the construction of proposed S. Mt. Loop, would this also be a more expensive option as fully depressing S. Mt. Loop 202?

Response: This aspect of implementation comes further into the design process.

Comment: Please show the major utilities as the presently aren't along proposed (Pecos Rd.) S. Mt. Loop 202 alignment and what utilities need to be moved including any gas or fuel lines. **Response:** This information will be part of the utility report.

Comment: I implore ADOT to please use underground radar mapping to identify and locate any cultural finds where soil will be removed to construct proposed S. Mt Loop 202 through identified Native American Indian cultural or sacred areas!

CAT Member Comment Cards

Statements shown below are recorded verbatim from comment cards.

Meeting Summary Comments

- Re: Question, has public sentiment changes?
- Public still wants the freeway. Ahwatukee wanted it until it wasn't going to go on Indian land. It is needed. It is wanted. Don't let the extreme few distract from the underlying need.
- There is a lot of support to build the freeway. AZ Rep. "Sensationalistic" reporting has stirred things up, but the bottom line is that population has outpaced infrastructure.
- The extreme few will always out yell the silent majority. Ahwatukee interests seem to dominate every meeting. Same issues over and over. Need to keep the meetings moving.

Questions Need Follow-up

- Bloomquist Pump
- Groundwater levels in Laveen
- How much total area will Tolleson lose to "right of way" i.e. ½ mile – 1 mile?

- Evaluate traffic circulation for Ahwatukee internally. (implications to Chandler, Ray, Warner, 48th)
- How small of a development/community is analyzed for impact if it's split or partial?
- What is the emp. # along Pecos?
- Still have Q's on social, visual, title VI – put back on agenda.
- How does impact to Chandler Blvd traffic since it's outside study area?
- Environmental Justice. Social Employ concentration figure is Bizarre for El. Population growth between Desert Foothills and 24th W.
- P. 6 How regularly does MAG update traffic forecasts. 2000 or older data is irrelevant.
- P. 5 Social What about how in the heck the west and Ahwatukee gets out during construction?
- P. 4 Social. Most of the people of Ahwatukee DON'T want to feel included, they like the cul-de-sac. Correct E1 Home #. Since 32nd removal or put both with and without.
- P. 4 of social conditions. 2nd paragraph from bottom is erroneous this free will alter internal mobility, sense of place and feeling of inclusion and continuity.
- 68 employer (economic strata) gone. # of employees in 55 align.
- Does ADOT talk to the State Real Estate Dept. Have this on the public report. This alignment.
- In the minutes, please clarify what you mean with regard to a vote of the people and the corridor by S. Mtn. And also identify the law you referred to that is open to interpretation.
- Building freeways will not solve the traffic problems of the valley. Induced traffic needs to be seriously looked at.
- The public does not all want the freeway. “No Build” is still a preferred option by many who care about S. Mtn. And clean air for kids.
- Specific circulation data on internal traffic circulation for Ahwatukee.
- Employment center map should include Central and N. Scottsdale employment areas.
- When will we discuss “induced traffic” concept and it's contribution to regional growth/trans.
- We are not spending enough time on S. Mtn. Impacts. (caught up in “street”)
- Keep us specifically apprised of talks to move alignment onto utility row at S. Mt.
- Elevation of this freeway at the S. Mtn for wildlife and floodway continuity is important.
- Impact to Liberty Road. By alignment at 18th-20th St.
- Desert Foothills: Access to post office. Access to new office complex North of post office.
- So, is the GRIC position “NO Build”? Why would GRIC not consider sacrificing non-sacred land vs. impacting a sacred site such as S. Mt.?
- 91st Ave water treatment line runs right under Pecos.
- Remind us which one of the west alignments produces the worst impact to I-10!

- Since the mountain is sacred, it would be incumbent upon GRIC to allow the freeway. A route around the mountain that would show that the tribe really is serious about the situation.
- Ahwatukee folks have a reprieve thus far, they deal with exhaust, noise, etc in time, they still have their homes.
- MAP with altered alignments.
- ADOT needs to meet with I-10 Pecos LOA.
- ADOT build a subdivision for the folks that are going to lose homes.
- D-6 Resolution of 2000 I-10 Pecos LOA were never consulted with that resolution.

Adjourn:

Next CAT Meeting

The next CAT meeting will be held Thursday, January 5, 2006 at 5:30 p.m. at the Learning Center Meeting Hall, Komatke Center, in District Six. Two members noted that due to holiday schedules they would likely miss the meeting.